REMARKS

Claims 1-54 were presented for examination. The Examiner rejected claims 1-54 as anticipated by Prinzing (United States Patent No. 6, 496, 202, hereafter "Prinzing"). Claim 28 has been amended. No claims have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-54 are now pending. Claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 37, and 46 are independent.

Summary of Prinzing

Prinzing discloses an invention used to customize a graphical user interface (GUI) that represents the view in a Model/View/Controller architecture. (See Prinzing, abstract). The view in Prinzing is intended to provide flexibility in composing varying implementations and structures. The purpose of the invention is to provide a customizable GUI, while avoiding static implementations used previously in prior art. (See Prinzing, column 6, lines 58-61).

Prinzing relies upon communication between a view, factory, and model components to synchronize the view with the model (See Prinzing, column 6, lines 50-55). Prinzing requires the use of a factory for the generation of the view (See Prinzing, column 6, lines 39-40). Information from the model is used to request that the factory create one or more view fragments of which the view is comprised. (See Prinzing, column 7, line 55-60). In Prinzing, the controller sends change requests to the model. A view instantiates one or more listeners and registers the listeners with the model. (See Prinzing, column 16, lines 34-39). When the model changes, the model notifies the listeners, and the listeners forward the notification to the view fragments of the factory (See Prinzing, column 16, lines 40-53). If the view determines that it needs to make modifications to reflect the changes, the changes are made by the factory. (See Prinzing, column 6, lines 50-55).

Rejection of Claims 1-54 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-54 as anticipated by Prinzing (United States Patent No. 6, 496, 202, hereafter "Prinzing"). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the pending claims.

With respect to claims 1, 19, and 37, the Examiner states that Prinzing teaches the claimed invention. Prinzing fails to anticipate the claimed invention since it fails to disclose each and every element of Applicants' independent claims. In particular, Prinzing fails to disclose receiving, with the user interface module, from the application program, after reaching

the processing point, an interaction object specifying data, and generating output data to render on the output device from the interaction object. (See claim 1). Applicants' independent claims, claims 1, 19, and 37, and the corresponding dependent claims 2-9, 20-27, and 38-45, include a user interface module, comprising the view and the controller, which receive an interaction object from an application program and generate output to render on the output device from the interaction object.

Prinzing fails to disclose the use of an interaction object in updating a view. Applicants' claims include an interaction object provided from the controller directly to the view, both of which reside on the user interface module. The controller receives the interaction object from the model and transfers the object directly to the view, within the user interface module, for rendering output data. There is no disclosure in Prinzing of a change to a view made because of direct communication between the controller and the view, nor does Prinzing disclose any use of an interaction object transmitted from the controller to the view. Although Prinzing discloses listeners on the view, these listeners do not perform the same steps as the controller does in transmission of the interaction object to the view. The listeners disclosed in Prinzing are instantiated on the view and there is no disclosure of transmission of an object from outside of the view to the view, such a view being capable of modifying itself by using and interaction object and without the use of a factory or a model. Nor is there any disclosure in Prinzing of any direct communication between the controller and the view, in contrast with the claimed invention where the controller and the view communicate directly to generate the necessary changes to the view using an interaction object.

Additionally, the nature and purpose of the controller in the claimed invention is entirely different from the purpose of the controller Prinzing discloses. Prinzing fails to disclose a single component including both a view and a controller in which the controller communicates directly to the view. In Prinzing, these two functions are performed by two separate components, the controller 512 and the view 504, which do not interact directly with each other. (See Prinzing, column 6, lines 46 and 50). The purpose of the controller in Prinzing varies as well, since in Prinzing the sole function of the controller is to send change requests to the model. In contrast, a controller in the claimed invention processes the statements itself to generate the output data the view receives, without the use of the model for output data generation. In Prinzing, the view update occurs prior to the model update. In contrast, the model in the claimed invention is updated by the controller after the generation of the output data and the updating of the view.

With respect to claim 10, 28, and 46, the Examiner states that Prinzing discloses the claimed invention. Prinzing fails to anticipate the claimed invention since it fails to disclose each and every element of Applicants' independent claims. In particular, Prinzing fails to disclose receiving user input in response to the output data rendered on the output device from the interaction object, adding the received user input into the interaction object, and returning the interaction object including the received user input to the application program. (See claim 10).

Applicants' independent claims, claims 10, 28, and 46, and corresponding dependent claims 11-18, 29-36, and 47-54, include an interaction object updated based upon received user input. A controller in the claimed invention requests an interaction object from the model, and provides it directly to the view, which renders the output data on the output device. When the controller receives user input in response to that rendered output data, it adds the received user input into the interaction object and returns the interaction object to the application program where the model resides.

Prinzing fails entirely to disclose the steps of acquiring user input, adding the input into an object, or transmitting the object to the model. Although in Prinzing the controller does send a change request to the model (see Prinzing, column 16, line 30), the controller in Prinzing does not send the request after the view update – the transmission is a request to initiate that update and thus, by its nature, requires transmission prior to updating the view. Nor does Prinzing disclose the model sending an object to the controller for modification and transmission back to the model. At no point in Prinzing does the model transmit an object of any kind to the controller. Additionally, the controller in Prinzing does not add user input to an existing object of any kind before sending the object to the model. No mention is made of including input from users in a transmission between the controller and the model in Prinzing. In contrast, in the claimed invention, the controller requests and receives an interaction object from the model, provides that object to the view and receives user input in response to that interaction object, which the controller then returns to the model.

Accordingly, since Prinzing fails to disclose all of the elements of claims 1-54, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the claims.

Application No.: 09/851832 Docket No.: SMQ-118/P6144

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: November 2, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Kevin J. Canning
Registration No.: 35,470
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
28 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant